

Effects of isovector scalar meson on hyperon star

S. K. Biswal, Bharat Kumar and S. K. Patra¹

¹ *Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar-751005, India*

(Dated: March 1, 2016)

We study the effects of isovector-scalar (δ)-meson on neutron star. Influence of δ -meson on both static and rotating neutron star is discussed. Inclusion of δ -meson in a neutron star system consisting of proton, neutron and electron, make the equation of state stiffer in higher density and consequently increases the maximum mass of the star. But induction of δ -meson in the hyperon star decreases the maximum mass of the hyperon star. This is due to the early evolution of hyperons in presence of δ -meson.

PACS numbers: 21.10.Dr, 23.40.-s, 23.60.+e, 24.75.+i

I. INTRODUCTION

Neutron star is a venerable candidate to discuss the physics at high density. We can not create such a high density in terrestrial laboratory, so neutron star is and the only object, which can provides many information on high density nature of the matter[1, 2]. But it is not an easy task to deal with the neutron star for it's complex nature, as all the four fundamental forces (strong, weak, gravitational and electromagnetic) are active. High gravitational field makes mandatory to use general theory of relativity for the study of neutron star structure. Equations of states (EOS) are the sole ingredient that must be supplied to the equation of stellar structure, Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkoff (TOV) equation, whose out-come is the mass-radius profile of the dense neutron star. In this case, the nuclear EOS plays an intimate role in deciding the mass-radius of a neutron star. Its indispensable important attracts the attention of physicists to have an anatomy of the interactions Lagrangian. As the name suggests, neutron star is not completely made up neutrons, a small fraction of protons and electrons are also present, which is the consequence of the β -equilibrium and charge neutrality condition[3]. Also, the presence of exotic degrees of freedom like hyperons and kaons can not be ignored in such a high dense matter. It is one among the most asymmetric and dense nuclear system in nature.

From last three decades [4, 5], the relativistic mean field (RMF) generalized by Walecka [6] and later on developed by Boguta and Bodmer [7] is one amongst the most reliable theory to deal with infinite nuclear matter and finite nuclei. The original RMF formalism starts with an effective Lagrangian, whose degrees of freedom are nucleons, σ -, ω -, ρ - and π -mesons. To reproduce proper experimental observable, it is extended to the self-interaction of σ -meson. Recently, all other self- and crossed interactions including the baryon octet are also introduced keeping in view the extra-ordinary condition of the system, such as highly asymmetric system or extremely high density medium [8]. Since the RMF formalism is an effective nucleons-mesons model, the coupling

constants for both nucleon-meson and hyperon-meson are fitted to reproduce the properties of selected nuclei and infinite nuclear matter properties [6, 7, 9, 10]. In this case, it is improper to use the parameters obtained from the free nucleon-nucleon scattering data. The parameters, with proper relativistic kinematics and with the mesons and their properties already known or fixed from the properties of a small number of finite nuclei, the method gives excellent results not only for spherical nuclei, but also of well-known deformed cases. The same force parametrization can be used both for β -stable and β -unstable nuclei through-out the periodic table [11–14].

The importance of the self- and crossed- interactions are significant for some specific properties of nuclei/nuclear-matter in certain conditions. For example, self-interaction of σ -meson takes care of the reduction of nuclear matter incompressibility K_∞ from an unacceptable high value of $K_\infty \sim 600$ MeV to a reasonable number of ~ 270 MeV [7, 15], while the self-interaction of vector meson ω soften the equation of state[14, 16]. Thus, it is imperative to include all the mesons and their possible interactions with nucleons, self- and crossed terms in the effective Lagrangian density. However, it is not necessary to do so, because of the symmetry reason and their heavy masses [17]. For example, to keep the spin-isospin and parity symmetry in the ground state, the contribution of π -meson is ignored [18] and also the effect of heavier mesons are neglected for their negligible contribution. Taking into this argument, in many versions of the RMF formalisms, the inclusion of isovector-scalar (δ) meson is neglected due to its small contribution. But recently it is seen [19–22] that the endowment of the δ -meson goes on increasing with density and asymmetry of nuclear system. Thus, it will be impossible for us to justify the abandon of δ -meson both conceptually and practically, while considering the highly asymmetry and dense nuclear system, like neutron star and relativistic heavy ion collision. Recent observation of neutron star like PSR J1614-2230 with mass of $(1.97 \pm 0.04)M_\odot$ [23] and the PSR J0348+0432 with mass of $(2.01 \pm 0.04)M_\odot$ [24] re-open the challenge in the dense matter physics. The heavy mass of PSR J0348+0432 ($M=2.01 \pm 0.04M_\odot$) forces the nuclear theorists to re-think the composition and interaction inside the neutron star. Therefore, it is important to establish the effects of the δ -meson and all possible interactions of other mesons for such compact and asymmetry system.

The paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II, we have

[1] sbiswal@iopb.res.in
[1] bharat@iopb.res.in
[1] patra@iopb.res.in

outlined a brief theoretical formalism. Here, the necessary steps of the RMF model and the inclusion of δ -meson is explained. The results and discussions are devoted in Sec. III. Here, we have attempted to explain the effects of δ -meson on the nuclear matter system like hyperon and proton-neutron stars. This analysis is done for both static and rotating neutron and neutron-hyperon stars. In this calculations, the E-RMF Lagrangian (G2 parameter set) is used to take care of all possible self- and crossed interactions [25]. On top of the G2 Lagrangian, the δ -meson interaction is added to take care of the isovector channel. The concluding remarks are given in section IV.

II. THEORETICAL FORMALISM

From last one decade a lot of work have been done to emphasize the role of δ -meson on both finite and infinite nuclear matter [26–29]. It is seen that the contribution of δ -meson to the symmetry energy is negative [30]. To fix the symmetry energy around the empirical value (~ 30 MeV) we need a large coupling constant of the ρ -meson g_ρ value in the absence of the g_δ . The proton and neutron effective masses split due to inclusion of δ -meson and consequently it affects the transport properties of neutron star [19]. The addition of δ -meson not only modify the property of infinite nuclear matter, but also enhances the spin-orbit splitting in the finite nuclei [26]. A lot of mystery are present in the effects of δ -meson till date. The motivation of the present paper is to study such information. It is to be noted that both the ρ - and δ -mesons correspond to the isospin asymmetry, and a careful precaution is essential while fixing the δ -meson coupling in the interaction.

The effective field theory and naturalness of the parameter are described in [25, 31–34]. The Lagrangian is consistent with underlying symmetries of the QCD. The G2 parameter is motivated by E-RMF theory. The terms of the Lagrangian are taken into account up to 4th order in meson-baryon coupling. For the study of isovector channel, we have introduced the isovector-scalar δ -meson. The baryon-meson interaction is given by [8]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \sum_B \bar{\Psi}_B (i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - m_B + g_{\sigma B}\sigma + g_{\delta B}\delta \cdot \tau) \Psi_B \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \sigma \partial_\mu \sigma - m_\sigma^2 \sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\kappa_3}{3!} \frac{g_\sigma \sigma}{m_B} + \frac{\kappa_4}{4!} \frac{g_\sigma^2 \sigma^2}{m_B^2} \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{4} \Omega_{\mu\nu} \Omega^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} m_\omega^2 \omega_\mu \omega^\mu \left(1 + \eta_1 \frac{g_\sigma \sigma}{m_B} + \frac{\eta_2}{2} \frac{g_\sigma^2 \sigma^2}{m_B^2} \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{4} R_{\mu\nu}^a R^{\mu\nu a} + \frac{1}{2} m_\rho^2 \rho_\mu^a \rho^{a\mu} \left(1 + \eta_\rho \frac{g_\sigma \sigma}{m_B} \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \delta \cdot \partial_\mu \delta - m_\delta^2 \delta^2 + \frac{1}{4!} \zeta_0 (g_\omega \omega_\mu \omega^\mu)^2 \\ & + \sum_l \bar{\Psi}_l (i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m_l) \Psi_l. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The co-variant derivative D_μ is defined as:

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu + ig_\omega \omega_\mu + ig_\rho I_3 \tau^a \rho_\mu^a, \quad (2)$$

where $R_{\mu\nu}^a$ and $\Omega_{\mu\nu}$ are field tensors and defined as follow

$$R_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu \rho_\nu^a - \partial_\nu \rho_\mu^a + g_\rho \epsilon_{abc} \rho_\mu^b \rho_\nu^c, \quad (3)$$

$$\Omega_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \omega_\nu - \partial_\nu \omega_\mu. \quad (4)$$

Here, σ , ω , ρ and δ are the sigma, omega, rho and delta meson fields, respectively and in real calculation, we ignore the non-abelian term from the ρ -field. All symbols are carrying their own usual meaning [8, 20].

The Lagrangian equation for different mesons are given by [8]:

$$\begin{aligned} m_\sigma^2 \left(\sigma_0 + \frac{g_\sigma \kappa_3 \sigma_0}{2m_B} + \frac{\kappa_4 g_\sigma^2 \sigma_0^2}{6m_B^2} \right) \sigma_0 - \frac{1}{2} m_\rho^2 \eta_\rho \frac{g_\sigma \rho_{03}^2}{m_B} \\ - \frac{1}{2} m_\omega^2 \left(\eta_1 \frac{g_\sigma}{m_B} + \eta_2 \frac{g_\sigma^2 \sigma_0}{m_B^2} \right) \omega_0^2 = \sum g_\sigma \rho_B^s, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$m_\omega^2 \left(1 + \eta_1 \frac{g_\sigma \sigma_0}{m_B} + \frac{\eta_2}{2} \frac{g_\sigma^2 \sigma_0^2}{m_B^2} \right) \omega_0 + \frac{1}{6} \zeta_0 g_\omega^2 \omega_0^3 = \sum g_\omega \rho_B, \quad (6)$$

$$m_\rho^2 \left(1 + \eta_\rho \frac{g_\sigma \sigma_0}{m_B} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \sum g_\rho \rho_{B3} \quad (7)$$

$$m_\delta^2 \delta^3 = g_\delta^2 \rho_{3B}^s \quad (8)$$

with $\rho_{3B}^s = \rho_p^s - \rho_n^s$, ρ_p^s and ρ_n^s are scalar densities for the proton and neutron, respectively. The total scalar density is expressed as the sum of the proton and neutron densities $\rho_B^s = \rho_p^s + \rho_n^s$, which is given by

$$\rho_i^s = \frac{2}{(2\pi)^3} \int_0^{k_i} \frac{M_i^* d^3 k}{E_i^*}, \quad i = p, n \quad (9)$$

and the vector (baryon) density

$$\rho_B = \frac{2}{(2\pi)^3} \int_0^{k_i} d^3 k, \quad (10)$$

where, $E_i^* = (k_i^2 + M_i^{*2})^{1/2}$ is the effective energy, k_i is the Fermi momentum of the baryons. M_p^* and M_n^* are the proton and neutron effective masses written as

$$M_p^* = M_p - g_\sigma \sigma_0 - g_\delta \delta^3 \quad (11)$$

$$M_n^* = M_n - g_\sigma \sigma_0 + g_\delta \delta^3, \quad (12)$$

which is solved self-consistently. I_3 is the third component of isospin projection and B stands for baryon octet. The energy and pressure density depends on the effective mass M_B^* of the system, which first needed to solve these self-consistent equations and obtained the fields for mesons. Using the Einstein's

energy-momentum tensor, the total energy and pressure density are given as [8]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} = & \sum_B \frac{2}{(2\pi)^3} \int_0^{k_B} d^3k E_B^*(k) + \frac{1}{8} \zeta_0 g_\omega^2 \omega_0^4 \\ & + m_\sigma^2 \sigma_0^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\kappa_3}{3!} \frac{g_\sigma \sigma_0}{m_B} + \frac{\kappa_4}{4!} \frac{g_\sigma^2 \sigma_0^2}{m_B^2} \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} m_\omega^2 \omega_0^2 \left(1 + \eta_1 \frac{g_\sigma \sigma_0}{m_B} + \frac{\eta_2}{2} \frac{g_\sigma^2 \sigma_0^2}{m_B^2} \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} m_\rho^2 \rho_{03}^2 \left(1 + \eta_\rho \frac{g_\sigma \sigma_0}{m_B} \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \frac{m_\delta^2}{g_\delta^2} (\delta^3)^2 + \sum_l \mathcal{E}_l, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} = & \sum_B \frac{2}{3(2\pi)^3} \int_0^{k_B} d^3k E_B^*(k) + \frac{1}{8} \zeta_0 g_\omega^2 \omega_0^4 \\ & - m_\sigma^2 \sigma_0^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\kappa_3}{3!} \frac{g_\sigma \sigma_0}{m_B} + \frac{\kappa_4}{4!} \frac{g_\sigma^2 \sigma_0^2}{m_B^2} \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} m_\omega^2 \omega_0^2 \left(1 + \eta_1 \frac{g_\sigma \sigma_0}{m_B} + \frac{\eta_2}{2} \frac{g_\sigma^2 \sigma_0^2}{m_B^2} \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} m_\rho^2 \rho_{03}^2 \left(1 + \eta_\rho \frac{g_\sigma \sigma_0}{m_B} \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \frac{m_\delta^2}{g_\delta^2} (\delta^3)^2 + \sum_l P_l, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where P_l and $\mathcal{E}_l$ are lepton's pressure and energy density, respectively.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Before going to the discussions of our results, we give a brief description of the parameter fitting procedure for g_ρ and g_δ in subsection III A. Then the results on hyperon star along with the neutron star structures both for static and rotating cases under β -equilibrium condition are discussed in the subsequent subsections III B, III C, III D, III E and III F.

A. Parameter Fitting

It is important to fix the g_δ value to see the effects of the δ -meson. The isovector channels in RMF theory come to exist through both the ρ and δ mesons couplings. While considering the effects of the δ -meson, we have to take the ρ -meson into account. Since both the isovector channels are related to isospin, one can not optimize the g_δ coupling independently. Here, we have followed a more reliable procedure by fixing the symmetry energy E_s by adjusting simultaneously different values of g_ρ and g_δ value[19]. As it is mentioned earlier,

we have added g_δ on top of the G2 parameter set. Thus, the symmetry energy of G2 parameter is $E_s = 36.4$ MeV is kept constant at the time of re-shuffling g_ρ and g_δ . The G2 parameters and the g_δ and g_δ combinations are displayed in Table I. The nuclear matter properties are also listed in the table.




FIG. 1: (Color online) Variation of g_ρ and g_δ at a constant value of symmetry energy $E_s = 36.4$ MeV for both nuclear and neutron matter.

For a particular value of $E_s = 36.4$ MeV, the variation of g_ρ and g_δ are plotted in Fig. 1. From Fig. 1, it is clear that as the g_δ increases the g_ρ value also increases, almost linearly, to fix the symmetry energy unchanged. This implies that ρ and δ -mesons have opposite effect on E_s contribution, i.e., the δ -meson has negative contribution of the symmetry energy contrary to the positive contribution of ρ -meson.

B. Fields of σ, ω, ρ and δ mesons

The fields of the meson play a crucial role to construct the nuclear potential, which is the deciding factor for all type of calculations in the relativistic mean field model. In Fig. 2, we have plotted various meson fields included in the present calculations, such as σ, ω, ρ and δ with g_δ on top of G2 parameter set ($G2 + g_\delta$). It is obvious that V_σ and V_ω are opposite to each other, which is also reflected in the figure. This means, the positive value of V_ω gives a strong repulsion, which is compensated by the strongly attractive potential of the σ -meson field V_σ . The nature of the curves for V_σ and V_ω are almost similar except the sign. The magnitude of V_σ and V_ω looks almost equal. However, in real (it is not clearly visible in the curve, because of the scale), the value of V_σ is slightly larger than V_ω , which keeps the overall nuclear potential strongly attractive. The attractive V_σ and repulsive V_ω potentials combinely give the saturation properties of the nuclear force. It is worthy to mention that the contributions of self-interaction terms are taken care both in V_σ and V_ω , which

TABLE I: The force parameters for G2 set are given in the upper panel of the Table. The nuclear matter saturation properties are given in the middle panel and various g_ρ and g_δ combinations are given in the lower panel, keeping symmetry energy $E_s = 36.4$ MeV fixed.

$m_n = 939.0$ MeV	$m_\sigma = 520.206$ MeV	$m_\omega = 782.0$ MeV	$m_\rho = 770.0$ MeV	$m_\delta = 980.0$ MeV	$\Lambda = 0.0$	$\zeta_0 = 2.642$	$\eta_\rho = 0.39$	
$g_\sigma = 10.5088$	$g_\omega = 12.7864$	$g_\rho = 9.5108$	$g_\delta = 0.0$	$k_3 = 3.2376$	$k_4 = 0.6939$	$\eta_1 = 0.65$	$\eta_2 = 0.11$	
$\rho_0 = 0.153$ fm $^{-3}$	$E/A = -16.07$ MeV	$K_\infty = 215$ MeV	$E_s = 36.4$ MeV	$m_n^*/m_n = 0.664$				
(g_ρ, g_δ)	(9.510, 0.0)	(9.612, 1.0)	(9.973, 2.0)	(10.550, 3.0)	(11.307, 4.0)	(12.212, 5.0)	(13.234, 6.0)	(14.349, 7.0)




FIG. 2: (Color online) Various meson fields are obtained from the RMF theory with $G2 + g_\delta$ and NL3 parameter sets. The σ - (V_σ) and ω - (V_ω) fields are compared with the results of DBHF theory [37].

are the key quantities to solve the Coester band problem [35] and the explanation of quark-gluon-plasma (QGP) formation within the relativistic mean field formalism [36]. The self-interaction of the σ -meson gives a repulsive force at long range part of the nuclear potential, which is equivalent to the 3-body interaction and responsible for the saturation properties of nuclear force. The calculated results of V_σ and V_ω are compared with the results obtained from DBHF theory with Bonn-A potential[37].

Fig. 2 clearly shows that in the low density region (density $\rho \sim 2\rho_0$) both RMF and DBHF theories well matched. But as it increases beyond density $\rho \sim 2\rho_0$ both the calculations deviate from each other. The possible reason may be the fitting of parameters in Bonn-A potential is up to 2–3 times of saturation density ρ_0 , beyond that the DBHF data are simple extrapolation of the DBHF theory. The contribution of both ρ - and δ - mesons correspond to the isovector channel. The δ -meson gives different effective masses for proton and neutron, because of their opposite iso-spin of the third component. The nuclear potential generated by the ρ - and δ -mesons are also shown in Fig 2. We noticed that although their contributions are small, but non-negligible. These non-zero values of V_ρ and V_δ to the nuclear potential has a larger consequence, mostly in compact dense object like neutron or

hyperon stars, which will be discussed later in this paper.

C. Energy per particle and pressure density

The energy density and pressure density are known as equations of states (EOS). These quantities are the key ingredients to describe the structure of neutron/hyperon stars. To see the sensitivity of the EOS, we have plotted energy per particle ($E/\rho - M$) as a function of density for pure neutron matter in Fig 3 and pressure density as a function of energy density in Fig 4. Each curve corresponds to a particular combination of g_δ and g_ρ , which reproduce the symmetry energy $E_s = 36.4$ MeV without destabilizing other parameters of G2 set. The green line represents for $g_\delta = 0$, i.e., with pure G2 parameter set. Both the binding energy per particle as well as the pressure density increase with the value of g_δ . This process continue till the value of g_δ reaches, at which $E/\rho - M$ equals the nuclear matter binding energy per particle. An unphysical situation arises beyond this value of g_δ , because the binding energy of the neutron matter will be greater than $E/\rho - M$ for symmetric nuclear matter. In the case of G2+ δ parametriza-




FIG. 3: (Color online) Variation of binding energy per particle with density at various g_ρ and g_δ .

tion, this limiting value of g_δ reaches at $g_\delta = 0.7$, after which we do not get a convergence solution in our calculations.




FIG. 4: (Color online) Variation of EOS for different values of g_ρ and g_δ .

D. Stellar properties of static and rotating neutron stars

The β -equilibrium and charge neutrality are two important conditions to justify the structural composition of the neutron/hyperon stars. Both these conditions force the stars to have $\sim 90\%$ of neutron and $\sim 10\%$ proton. With the inclusion of baryons, the β -equilibrium conditions between chemical potentials for different particles:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_p &= \mu_{\Sigma^+} = \mu_n - \mu_e \\ \mu_n &= \mu_{\Sigma^0} = \mu_{\Xi^0} = \mu_n \\ \mu_{\Sigma^-} &= \mu_{\Xi^-} = \mu_n + \mu_e \\ \mu_\mu &= \mu_e\end{aligned}\quad (15)$$

and the charge neutrality condition is satisfy by

$$n_p + n_{\Sigma^+} = n_e + n_{\mu^-} + n_{\Sigma^-} + n_{\Xi^-} \quad (16)$$

To calculate the mass and radius profile of the static (non-rotating), but spherical neutron star, we solve the general relativity Tolmann-Oppenheimer-Volkov (TOV)[38] equations which are written as:

$$\frac{dP(r)}{dr} = -\frac{G}{c^2} \frac{[\mathcal{E}(r) + P(r)][M(r) + \frac{4\pi r^3 P(r)}{c^2}]}{r^2(1 - \frac{2GM(r)}{c^2 r})} \quad (17)$$

and

$$\frac{dM(r)}{dr} = \frac{4\pi r^2 \mathcal{E}(r)}{c^2}, \quad (18)$$

with G as the gravitational constant, $\mathcal{E}(r)$ as the energy density, $P(r)$ as the pressure density and $M(r)$ as the gravitational mass inside radius r . We have used $c=1$. For a given EOS,

these equations can be integrated from the origin as an initial value problem for a given choice of the central density $\mathcal{E}_c(r)$. The value of $r (= R)$ at which the pressure vanishes defines the surface of the star. In order to understand the effect of δ -meson coupling on neutron star structure, we must also look, what happens to massive objects as they rotate and how this affects the space-time around them. For this, we use the




FIG. 5: (Color online) The mass-radius profile for static star with different parametrizations like G2[25], NL3[13], NL3*[39], NL-SH[12], FSU[16] and FSU2[40]. (a) The left panel is for proton-neutron star and (b) the right panel is for the hyperon star.

code written by Stergioulas[41] based on Komastu, Eriguchi, and Hachisu (KEH) method (fast rotation)[42, 43] to construct mass-radius of the uniform rotating star. One should note that the maximum mass of static star is less than the rotating stars. Because, when the massive objects rotate they flatten at their poles. The forces of rotation, namely the effective centrifugal force, pulls the mass farthest from the center further out, creating the equatorial bulge. This pull away from the center will, in part, counteract gravity, allowing the star to be able to support more mass than its non-rotating star.

We know that the core of neutron stars contain hyperons a very high density ($\sim 7-8 \rho_0$) matter. As it is mentioned before, with the presence of baryons, the EOS becomes softer and stellar properties will be changed. The maximum mass of hyperon star decreases about 10-20% depending on the choice of the meson-hyperon coupling constants. The hyperon couplings are expressed as the ratio between the meson-hyperon and meson-nucleon couplings as:

$$\chi_\sigma = \frac{g_{Y\sigma}}{g_{N\sigma}}, \chi_\omega = \frac{g_{Y\omega}}{g_{N\omega}}, \chi_\rho = \frac{g_{Y\rho}}{g_{N\rho}}, \chi_\delta = \frac{g_{Y\delta}}{g_{N\delta}}. \quad (19)$$

In the present calculations, we have taken $\chi_\sigma = \chi_\rho = \chi_\delta = 0.6104$ and $\chi_\omega = 0.6666$ [44]. One can find similar calculations for stellar mass in Refs. [45–47]. Now we present the star properties like mass and radius in Figs. 5, 6 and 7. In Fig. 5 we plotted the mass-radius profile for the proton-neutron star

as well as for the hyperon star using a wide variation of parameter sets starting from the old parameter like NL-SH[12] to the new set of FSU2 [40]. The mass-radius profile varies to a great extend over the choice of the parameter. For example, in FSU parameter set [16], the maximum possible mass of the proton-neutron star is $\sim 1.75 M_\odot$, while the maximum possible mass for the NL3 set [13] is $\sim 2.8 M_\odot$. These results are shown in the left panel of the Fig. 5, while right panel show same things for the hyperon star.

E. Effects of δ -meson on static and rotating stars

The main aim of this paper is to understand the effects of δ -meson on neutron stars both with and without hyperons. Figs. 6 and 7 represent the mass-radius profiles for non-rotating stars taking into account the presence of with and without hyperons. These profiles are shown for various combinations of g_ρ and g_δ , which we have obtained by fitting the symmetry energy E_s of pure nuclear matter. Analyzing the




FIG. 6: (Color online) The mass-radius profile of the static proton-neutron and hyperon stars with various combination of g_δ and g_ρ in G2+ δ . (a) The left panel is for proton-neutron star and (b) the right panel is for the hyperon star.

graphs, we notice a slight change in the maximum mass with g_δ value. That means, the mass of the star goes on decreasing with an increase value of the δ -meson coupling. A further inspection of the results reveals that, although the δ -meson coupling has a nominal effects on the maximum mass of the stars, we get an asymptotic increase in the radius. This asymptotic nature of the curves is more prominent in presence of hyperons inside the stars. Similar phenomena are also observed in case of rotating stars.




FIG. 7: (Color online) Same as Fig 6, but for rotating stars.

F. Effects of δ -meson on baryon production

Finally, we want to see the effects of δ -meson coupling on the particle production for the whole baryonic family at various densities in nuclear matter system. The Fermi energy




FIG. 8: (Color online) Yield of strange particles as a function of density. The upper panel is with G2 parameter set (without taking δ -meson coupling) and the lower panel is with δ -meson coupling.

of both proton and neutron increases with density for their Fermionic nature. After a certain density, the Fermi energy of the nucleon exceeded the rest mass energy of the nucleon (~ 1000 MeV), and strange particles (Σ, Λ, Ξ) are produced. As a result, the equations of state of the star becomes soft and gives a smaller star mass compare to the neutron star containing only protons, neutrons and electrons. The decrease in star

mass in the presence of whole baryon octet can be understood from the analysis of Fig. 8. From the figure it is clear that δ -meson has a great impact on the production of hyperons. The inclusion of δ -meson accelerate the strange particle production. For example, the evolution of Σ^- takes place at density $\rho = 1.75\rho_0$ in absence of δ -meson. However, it produces at $\rho = 1.67\rho_0$ when δ -meson is there in the system. Similarly, analyzing the evolution of other baryons, we notice that although the early production of baryons in the presence of δ -meson is not proportionate to each other, in each case the yield is faster. A significant shifting towards lower density is maximum for heaviest hyperon (Ξ^0) and minimum for nucleon (see Fig. 8). For example, Ξ^- evolves at $\rho_B = 6.5\rho_0$ for a non- δ system and $\rho_B \sim 5.0\rho_0$ for medium when δ -meson is included. Thus, the δ -coupling has a sizable impact on the production of hyperons like Ξ^-, Ξ^0, Σ^+ .

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary, using the effective field theory approach, we discussed the effect of isovector scalar meson on hyperon star.

Inclusion of δ -meson with G2 parameter set, we have investigated the static and rotating stellar properties of neutron star with hyperons. We fitted the parameter and see the variation of g_ρ and g_δ at a constant symmetry energy for both the nuclear and neutron matter. With the help of G2+ δ model, for static and rotating stars without hyperon, core we get the maximum mass of $\sim 2M_\odot$ and $\sim 2.4M_\odot$, respectively. This prediction of masses is in agreement with the recent observation of $M \sim 2M_\odot$ of the stars. However, with hyperon core the maximum mass obtained are $\sim 1.4M_\odot$ and $\sim 1.6M_\odot$ for static and rotating hyperon stars, respectively. In addition, we have also calculated the production of whole baryon octet with variation in density. We find that the particle fraction changes a lot in presence of δ -meson coupling. When there is δ -meson in the system the evolution of baryons are faster compare to a non- δ system. This effect is significant for heavier masses and minimum for lighter baryon. Hence, one can conclude that the yield of baryon/hyperons depends very much on the mesons couplings.

-
- [1] J. M. Lattimer and M. Prakash Science **304**, 536 (2004).
 - [2] J. M. Lattimer and M. Prakash Phys. Rep. **442**, 109 (2007).
 - [3] N. K. Glendenning, Astrophys J. **293**, 470 (1985).
 - [4] P. G. Reinhard, Rep. Prog. Phys. **52**, 439 (1989).
 - [5] P. Ring, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **37**, 193 (1996).
 - [6] J. D. Walecka, Ann. Phys. (N. Y.) **83**, 491 (1974).
 - [7] J. Boguta and A. R. Bodmer, Nucl. Phys. A **292**, 413 (1977).
 - [8] B. K. Sharma, P. K. Panda and S. K. Patra, Phys. Rev. C **75**, 035808 (2007).
 - [9] P. G. Reinhard, M. Rufa, J. Maruhn, W. Greiner, and J. Friedrich, Z. Phys. A **323**, 13 (1986).
 - [10] Y. K. Gambhir, P. Ring, and A. Thimet, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **198**, 132 (1990).
 - [11] P. G. Reinhard, Z. Phys. A **329**, 257 (1988).
 - [12] M. M. Sharma, G. A. Lalazissis, and P. Ring, Phys. Lett. B **312**, 377 (1993).
 - [13] G. A. Lalazissis, J. Konig, and P. Ring, Phys. Rev. C **55**, 540 (1997).
 - [14] Y. Sugahara and H. Toki, Nucl. Phys. A **579**, 557 (1994).
 - [15] A. R. Bodmer, Nucl. Phys. A **526**, 703 (1991).
 - [16] B. G. Todd-Rutel and J. Piekarewicz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 122501 (2005).
 - [17] R. Machleidt, K. Holinde and Ch. Elster, Phys. Rep. **149** 1, (1987).
 - [18] L. D. Miller and A. E. S. Green, Phys. Rev. C **5**, 241 (1971).
 - [19] S. Kubis and M. Kutschera, Phys. Lett. B **399**, 191 (1997).
 - [20] S. K. Singh, S. K. Biswal, M. Bhuyan, and S. K. Patra, Phys. Rev. C **89**, 044001 (2014).
 - [21] S. K. Singh, S. K. Biswal, M. Bhuyan and S. K. Patra, J. Phys. G **41**, 055201 (2014).
 - [22] X. Roca-Maza, X. Viñas, M. Centelles, P. Ring and P. Schuck **84**, 054309 (2011).
 - [23] P. B. Demorest, T. Pennucci, S. M. Ransom, M. S. E. Roberts, and J. W. T. Hessels, Nature (London) **467**, 1081 (2010).
 - [24] J. Antoniadis et al., Science **340**, 6131 (2013).
 - [25] R. J. Furnstahl, B. D. Serot, Hua-Bin Tang, Nucl. Phys. A **615**, 441 (1997).
 - [26] F. Hofmann, C. M. Keil, and H. Lenske, Phys. Rev. C **64**, 034314 (2001).
 - [27] B. Liu, V. Greco, V. Baran, M. Colonna and M. Di Toro, Phys. Rev. C **65**, 045201 (2002).
 - [28] D. P. Menezes and C. Providência, Phys. Rev. C **70**, 058801 (2004).
 - [29] A. Sulaksono, P. T. P. Hutaauruk, and T. Mart, Phys. Rev. C **72**, 065801 (2005).
 - [30] S. K. Singh, M. Bhuyan, P. K. Panda and S. K. Patra, J. Phys. G **40**, 085104 (2013).
 - [31] R. J. Furnstahl, B. D. Serot and H. B. Tang, Nucl. Phys. A **598**, 539 (1996).
 - [32] H. Müller and B. D. Serot, Nucl. Phys. A **606**, 508 (1996).
 - [33] R. J. Furnstahl and B. D. Serot, Nucl. Phys. A **671**, 447 (2000).
 - [34] R. Machleidt and D. R. Entem, Phys. Rep. **503**, 1 (2011).
 - [35] B. B. Sahu, S. K. Singh, M. Bhuyan, S. K. Biswal and S. K. Patra, Phys. Rev. C **89**, 034614 (2014).
 - [36] S. K. Biswal, S. K. Singh, M. Bhuyan and S. K. Patra, Brazilian Journal of Physics, **45**, 347 (2015).
 - [37] R. Brockmann and R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. C **42**, 1965 (1990).
 - [38] J. R. Oppenheimer and G. M. Volkoff, Phys. Rev. **55**, 374 (1939); R. C. Tolman, Phys. Rev. **55**, 364 (1939).
 - [39] G. A. Lalazissis, S. Karatzikos, R. Fossion, D. Pena Arteaga, A. V. Afanasjev, P. Ring, Phys. Lett. B **671**, 36 (2009).
 - [40] W. -C. Chen and J. Piekarewicz, Phys. Rev. C **90**, 044305 (2014).
 - [41] N. Stergioulas and J. L. Friedman, Astrophys. J. **444**, 306 (1995).
 - [42] H. Komatsu, Y. Eriguchi, and I. Hachisu, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **237**, 355 (1989).
 - [43] H. Komatsu, Y. Eriguchi, and I. Hachisu, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **239**, 153 (1989).
 - [44] N. K. Glendenning, S. A. Moszkowski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2414

- (1991).
- [45] N. K. Glendening, *Compact Stars*, Springer, New York -Second Edition (2000).
- [46] S. Weissenborn, D. Chatterjee, J. Schaffner-Bielich, Nucl. Phys. A **881**, 62 (2012); S. Weissenborn, D. Chatterjee, J. Schaffner-Bielich, Phys. Rev. C **85**, 065802 (2012).
- [47] L. L. Lopes and D. P. Menezes, Phys. Rev. C **89**, 025805 (2014).